

## REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 7, 13, 17, and 19-22 are amended herein. New claim 23 is added herein. Support for the amendments to the claims, and for the new claim, may be found in the claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

The amendments are directed substantially to matters of form, and are thus not for *any reason of patentability*. To the contrary, the claims were believed to have been in condition for allowance prior to the amendments, as noted in our previous responses. Reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 5 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to satisfy the written description requirement. The rejection is traversed.

The Office Action asserts that it is unclear how command torques are altered in accordance with the type of material, shape or weight of the object.

To the contrary, as described at page 7, lines 6-9 of the specification,

It is determined whether or not the holding operation of the object W by the robot hand 11 is completed based on determination whether or not an output torque (driving current) of the servomotors for driving the fingers of the robot hand 11 reaches set values (Step S5).

Thus, for the servomotors in question, the output torque of the servomotor may be proportional to the driving current. Consequently, the output torque of the servomotors may be controlled by raising or lowering the driving current. Raising and lowering a driving current has been familiar to those of skill in the art since Ampère.

It follows, then, that the holding operation, completion of which may be affected by, e.g. for shape, material, hardness and weight of the object, may be monitored by determining whether a driving current, and consequently an output torque, of the servomotors for driving the fingers of the robot hand 11 reaches a set value.

Furthermore, as described at page 8, lines 9-12 of the specification,

Further, a desired holding force suitable for shape, material, hardness and weight of the object is obtained by setting command torques for obtaining the desired holding force to the controllers of the servomotors for driving the fingers of the robot hand 11.

Thus, the ultimate output torque achieved by the servomotors can be adjusted by adjusting the set values. For example, a heavier object might require a heightened set value,

which will, in turn, produce a higher driving current at the servomotor, causing the servomotor to produce a higher output torque, commensurate with the weight of the object. Claims 5 and 17 are thus submitted to meet the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph:

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Claims 1, 7, 13, 17, and 19-22 were amended to make them more definite.

With respect to the rejections of claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 20, and 21 to the effect that the phrase “associated with the movable device,” is indefinite, the Applicants request respectfully some showing as to where in 35 U.S.C. § 112 the requirement that elements of claims must “set forth a positive relationship” may be found. It is submitted, rather, that there is no such requirement anywhere in 35 U.S.C. § 112. It is further submitted that such a requirement would render so-called “kit” or “bag of parts” claims indefinite, which they are not.

Furthermore, the recitation “associated with the movable device,” is submitted to meet the requirements 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, since according to The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition, the word “associated” means “to connect or join together; combine,” while according to WordNet ® 2.0, © 2003 Princeton University, the word “associated” means “related to or accompanying,” or “joined in some kind of relationship.”

The phrases dealing with calculations have been removed from claims 19 and 20.

With respect to the rejections of claims 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 20, and 21 to the effect that, e.g. the controller in claim 6 should be “correlated” with the compensating means in claim 1, the Applicants request respectfully some showing as to where in 35 U.S.C. § 112 the requirement that elements of claims must “correlate” with one another may be found. It is submitted, rather, that there is no such requirement anywhere in 35 U.S.C. § 112. Furthermore, the recitations of claims 1-22 are submitted to recite operable devices. Withdrawal of the rejections is earnestly solicited.

New Claim 23:

None of the references cited to date teach, disclose, or suggest compensating for the position of an object relative to a robot hand. New claim 23 is thus believed to be allowable.

**Conclusion:**

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 26 OCT 05

By: 

Thomas E. McKiernan  
Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501